

2



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/801,564	03/08/2001	Ashley Saulsbury	016747014610	5355
20350	7590	09/22/2004	EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			DO, CHAT C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2124	

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/801,564

Applicant(s)

SAULSBURY ET AL.

Examiner

Chat C. Do

Art Unit

2124

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 20 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 112 rejection for claims 1-2, 4-8, and 23.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See below.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 1-2, 4-13, 15-24.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
ANIL KHATRI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

- Part 5(c): Lin et al. disclose in Figures 4a, 7, 9, 12, and 16-17 a processing core comprising: a first source register including a plurality of first operands a plurality of second operands (SRC1, SRC2 and abstract); a bit-wise inverter coupled to at least one of the first plurality of operands and the second plurality of operands (1603 in Figure 16); a destination register including a plurality of results (DEST in abstract and col. 2 lines 55-59); a plurality of arithmetic processors (907a-907h in Figure 9) respectively coupled to the first operands (Source1), second operands (Source2) and results (910a-910h in Figure 9), wherein each arithmetic processor computes one of a sum and a difference of the first operand and a respective second operand (either addition or subtraction in Figure 9). Even though Lin et al. do not explicitly disclose the plurality of second operands are equal in value to an immediate value and the immediate value is specified in an instruction that identifies the first source register. However, Mennemeier discloses in Figures 7 and 11a the plurality of second operands are equal in value to an immediate value (e.g. first operand is equal to third operand and second operand is equal to fourth operand in 720 of Figure 7) and the immediate value is specified in an instruction (1112, 1114, and 1116 in Figure 11a) that identifies the first source register. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention is made to have a plurality of second operands are equal in value and specified in an instruction as seen in Mennemeier's invention into Lin et al.'s invention because it would enable easily and efficiently to process multiple data on a constant (e.g constant coefficients) in image processing.